



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/524,825 | 02/18/2005 | Hidetsugu Ikeda | 285358US0PCT | 1651 |
| 22850 7590 02/27/2009 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314 | | | | |
| EXAMINER CROUSE, BRETT ALAN | | | | |
| ART UNIT 1794 | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| NOTIFICATION DATE 02/27/2009 | | DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/524,825

Applicant(s)

IKEDA ET AL.

Examiner

Brett A. Crouse

Art Unit

1794

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Brett A. Crouse.(3) Dr. Toshiya Abiko.(2) Jay Rowe.

(4) ____.

Date of Interview: 17 February 2009.Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conferencec) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☒ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,2,4-9 and 11-15.Identification of prior art discussed: US 5935721; US 5972247; EP 1009044; JP 2001097897.Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The applied prior art was reviewed opposite what type of showing would establish unexpected results. The breadth of the showing opposite the scope of instant formulae 1 and 2 was also discussed.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Brett A. Crouse/
Examiner, Art Unit 1794/D. Lawrence Tarazano/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1794